

**From:** [Sanchez, Brian](#)  
**To:** [Archer, Allie](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Draft Progress Report  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 6, 2020 10:35:02 AM

---

---

**From:** Schmetterling, David <DSchmetterling@mt.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 10, 2019 2:23 PM  
**To:** Sanchez, Brian <sanchez.brian@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Selch, Trevor <TSelch@mt.gov>; Clark, Robert <RobClark@mt.gov>; Elam, Tracy <TElam@mt.gov>; Merritt, Steven <Merritt.Steven@epa.gov>; Wall, Dan <wall.dan@epa.gov>; Archer, Allie <Archer.Allie@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Progress Report

Hi Brian,

In addition to the fish we collected, according to the Statement of Work the other deliverable we agreed to were progress reports. . I tried to address the elements outlined in in the Statement of Work (below), but we also have photos, and field forms (though the salient information is captured in the attached spreadsheet) if you are interested. Please let me know if there is a specific format you would like me to follow or if you need any more information or have any questions

“MFWP will communicate with EPA throughout the collection effort. When the collections are complete (mid-late June 2019), MFWP will provide a brief report of the of the collection effort to EPA. The report should, at a minimum, include the following components:

1. Collection dates
2. GPS coordinates of upstream and downstream extents of areas sampled within each reach
3. Sample information associated with any QA/QC samples collected
4. Crew member names
5. Detailed notes of any deviations from the QAPP.”

#### **Collection Dates, GPS coordinates, sampling crew members**

Attached is a spreadsheet that shows the metadata for the fish sampling we conducted between June 17 and June 21, 2019 (including items 1 and 2 from above). In all events, the sampling crew was the same: Rob Clark, Tracy Elam and myself. Trevor Selch assisted on June 17 and 18, from the shore.

#### **QA/ QC samples**

We did not retain any information about the QA/ QC (trip blank) samples, that information stayed with the samples. We signed the chain of custody form for each sample and recorded the relevant information (location, date, time and collector) on the bottles.

We still need to get a QA/QC sample from our boat once it gets out of the shop (see below for details). On June 17 when we used that boat and began sampling, we were not given bottles for the QA/ QC sample collection. On June 18-21 we collected QA/ QC samples at each site, but it was with a different boat, generator and outboard motor.

### **Deviations from the QAPP**

The only deviations from the QAPP were the actual bounds of the sampling reaches (see attached), electrofishing boat we used for the majority of the sampling, and sizes of fish we collected.

In general we had to sample longer reaches than anticipated because of our low capture efficiency for fish because of the sampling conditions.

Regarding the electrofishing boat we used, on the first day of sampling we used the boat described in the QAPP, an 18' center console Wooldridge hull with a 200 HP Evinrude E-Tec 2-stroke motor, and a 6600 watt Yamaha generator. However, as a result of sampling the Bitterroot River sloughs to collect Northern Pike, which, because of the water clarity, temperature and discharge were overgrown with emergent macrophytes, we rendered the motor inoperable. Bits of the macrophytes got pumped through the motor and created several clogs, which took days at a shop to get removed. As a result, we used a different boat (loaned from FWP in Great Falls), which was a similar hull (18' Wooldridge center console), but used a different outboard motor (150 HP Yamaha 4-stroke jet, Honda 6500 watt generator). We used our same dip nets, live cars, live well (with lid), and other gear for sampling- just the boat, generator, and motor were different.

Although we do not have data on the fish lengths we collected (to reduce any confounding variables or contact with any sources of contamination, we minimized fish handling in the field), many of these fish exceeded the sizes recommended in the QAPP. This was done for several reasons:

1. Availability of fish
  - a. Since we were not sampling in very efficient conditions we did not have the ability in many reaches to be as careful to select the size of fish that matched the QAPP
2. We strived for consistent fish lengths between sites
3. We erred on larger fish that would be more reflective of bioaccumulation and biomagnification

Sincerely,  
David

### **David Schmetterling**

*Fisheries Research Coordinator*

Fisheries Division

[Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks](#)

3201 Spurgin Road

Missoula, Montana 59804

Ph: (406) 542-5514

[Montana FWP](#) | [Montana Outdoors Magazine](#)

f	i	t	y	p	